Review of Guillelmus de Conchis, Glosae super Platonem, ed. E. Jeauneau (Guillelmi de Conchis Opera Omnia, III; Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 203), Turnhout 2006

Nauta, Lodi

Published in:
Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies

Publication date:
2008

Guillelmus de Conchis, *Glosae super Platonem,* ed. Eduardus A. Jeauneau. Editio noua trium codicum nuper repertorum testimonio suffulta. (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaeualis, 203; Guillelmi de Conchis Opera Omnia, 3.) Turnhout: Brepols, 2006. Pp. cxlvi, 402 plus 4 black-and-white plates; black-and-white figures. €240. Accompanying vol.: Instrumenta Lexicologica Latina, A/184. Paper. Pp. vii, 59 plus 8 microfiches in back cover pocket.

In 1965 Édouard Jeauneau published his edition of William of Conches's *Glosae super Platonem.* It proved to be a seminal edition, which encouraged many scholars to pursue the study of medieval Platonism and the scholarly world of William and his contemporaries. It was photographically reprinted by Vrin in 2005—a fact that, oddly enough, is not mentioned in the edition under review. This is a new edition, and as such the third volume in the Opera Omnia series, after the *Dragmaticon* (edited by Italo Ronca, 1997) and the *Glosae super Boetium* (edited by this reviewer, 1999). After the first two editions, the project stagnated. In the preface Jeauneau tells us in (too) great detail about the stagnation, quoting from letters and e-mails and referring to telephone calls.

Since scholars are acquainted with William's important work from the 1965 edition, it is interesting to see where the new edition differs from the old one. Jeauneau's introduction follows roughly that of the 1965 edition, treating William's life and works, his style of glossing, the sources of the *Glosae,* and its *Nachleben.* The introduction has been updated, but since similar accounts have been given in the other editions of William's works (which are often indebted to Jeauneau's edition and articles), it will not surprise the well-informed scholar.

Concerning the text of the *Glosae,* Jeauneau rightly says that "cette nouvelle édition ne prétend pas opérer une révolution dans le texte qui fut publié en 1965" (p. xcvi). Indeed, the edition offers largely the same text, but some readings have been corrected, the critical apparatus has been revised, and the source apparatus updated and expanded. The *stemma codicum,* cautiously presented in the 1965 edition, has disappeared. To the list of eight manuscripts three new ones have been added (all three, however, containing only a partial text), of which one especially (from Salamanca) has proved to be useful in correcting (or corroborating) some readings. The edition is still based on *F,* a Florentine manuscript, emended and corrected mainly by three or four other manuscripts. *F* sometimes presents a longer text ("plus prolixe," p. xcv) and is the sole testimony of some longer passages and of one entire "chapter." Those additions, as Jeauneau admits, may not be authentic. They are kept, however, in the main text rather than relegated, like the additions found in the other manuscripts, to the critical apparatus. (In this case it would perhaps be preferable to mark the longer additions with an asterisk.) As any editor of medieval glosses knows, consistency is not always easy to attain, and Jeauneau's policy is understandable. Yet, some more information on readings, omissions, and additions in the manuscripts would have been helpful (cf. my edition of *Glosae super Boetium,* pp. cxii–cxxii).

Another manuscript, from Venice (*V*), presents a clearly longer version of the text, that is, longer than *F* and the other manuscripts. Jeauneau rightly doubts the authenticity of parts of this version, and in the 1965 edition he gave the text of the first twenty-two chapters in a separate appendix, while additions from the rest of the text were relegated to the critical apparatus. He follows the same practice now concerning the chapters from 23 onwards—the variant readings of *V* are given in the *apparatus criticus*—but he has inexplicably dropped the appendix containing the longer passages of *V* in chapters 1–22 and does not include those readings in the *apparatus.* That is a pity for these passages from *V* definitely belong to the "Conchian" corpus of Plato glosses. The 2006 edition includes a new appendix with glosses from an Oxford manuscript, published by Jeauneau in an article in 1966. This set of glosses is certainly indebted to William's, but so are the passages from

V, so it seems inconsistent not to give all of the latter ones as well. The other appendix in the 1965 edition contained information on some other manuscripts that testify to the influence of William's glosses. This appendix, slightly expanded, has been kept in the new edition. Further, the footnotes for referring to variant readings have been replaced by a line numbering system; this is a great improvement. Diphthongs have been restored (for instance, *ae* instead of *e*) in accordance with William's own opinions on diphthongs. All in all, even though the changes are not drastic, they have improved the text. It is to be hoped that the new edition will stimulate the other editors to make progress with their assigned tasks.

Lodi Nauta, University of Groningen

Keiko Hamaguchi, *Non-European Women in Chaucer: A Postcolonial Study.* (Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 14.) Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006. Paper. Pp. ix, 194. $43.95.

Borrowing the notion of "slippage" from the work of Homi Bhabha (p. 11), in *Non-European Women in Chaucer* Keiko Hamaguchi seeks to unsettle the critical orthodoxy that Chaucer's work presents a unitary view of the Other, especially of the Oriental woman. In five chapters devoted to five non-European female characters—the Syrian mother-in-law in the Man of Law's Tale, Canacee in the Squire's Tale, Dido in the *House of Fame* and the *Legend of Good Women,* Emelye in the Knight's Tale, and Zenobia in the Monk's Tale—she demonstrates that these women gaze back upon their male oppressors and perform acts of resistance (especially through mimicry) to patriarchal and colonialist attempts at definition and control. (Three of the chapters contain material previously published; the introduction, conclusion, and two chapters are new.) Hamaguchi's critical project requires her to separate the categories of gender and race in order to demonstrate the layering of one upon the other. In one case, gender and race reinforce each other, and in another, gender may produce a position of privilege for a woman character that works against her subjugation by race and may even turn her into an oppressor of sorts. Hamaguchi's goal is to reveal the variety and ambivalence of such competing identities as they strain against each other and to display Chaucer's own ambivalent position on gender and cultural difference, as he both reinscribes and resists the double dominance of patriarchy and colonialism.

At her best Hamaguchi offers readings that are useful and suggestive, even if difficult to follow. Chapter 5, published previously in *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* (2004) and the best chapter of the book, provides a provocative analysis of the Knight's Tale that characterizes the Athenian duke Theseus's uneven attempts to dominate threatening Amazonian sexuality. On the one hand, Theseus transforms the Amazonian queen, Hippolyta, into a Western courtly heroine, who takes her cue from the weeping Theban women when she prostrates herself at Theseus's feet, supplicating on behalf of fellow outcasts Palamon and Arcite (pp. 104–5). On the other hand, mimicry can be an effective instrument of subversion. As the Amazonian sisters adopt Athenian customs, they also carry their past histories with them and express "slippage," chiefly through the character of Emelye, whose disorienting "return gaze" (p. 111) upon Arcite after the tournament coincides with the key moment of violent reversal in the tale: Arcite's sudden death. Under Chaucer's careful guidance, the Knight's "narration cannot completely cover up [Emelye's] Amazonian body" (p. 109), as emerges in the narrator's awkward description of her bathing rites (lines 2282–86) and in the reappearance of Emelye's colors—red and white—in Arcite's funeral rites. While the tale ends with the expected patriarchal conclusion to the romance marriage